

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/678,025	10/04/2000	Toru Koizumi	35.C14850 5647		
5514 75	590 10/29/2002				
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER		
			KAO, CHIH CHENG G		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			2882		

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)				
ii . B		09/678,025	i	KOIZUMI, TORU				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Chih-Cheng Gler		2882				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover	sheet with the cor	rrespondence addi	ess			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faill - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. s period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, howe within the statutory mir vill apply and will expire cause the application to	ever, may a reply be timely imum of thirty (30) days w SIX (6) MONTHS from the b become ABANDONED	y filed will be considered timely. e mailing date of this com (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 J	luly 2002 .						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) Th	is action is non-fi	nal.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for fo Ex parte Quayle,	ormal matters, pros 1935 C.D. 11, 45	secution as to the 3 O.G. 213.	ments is			
_	ion of Claims							
4)[Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray		ation					
5\□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	wii irom consider	ation.					
·	☑ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election require	ment.					
	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b)∏ object	ed to by the Exami	ner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			, ,				
11)⊠	The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>09 Jul</u>			approved by the Ex	aminer.			
40)□	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	-	ion.					
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.						
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
	13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)	All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).		age			
14) 🗌 A	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(e)	(to a provisional a	pplication).			
) \square The translation of the foreign language pro- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti				,			
Attachmen		, ,	33 u	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) 5) 6)	Interview Summary (F Notice of Informal Pat Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/678,025

Art Unit: 2882

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochi et al. (US Patent 6,188,094 B1) in view of Goto et al. (US Patent 5237423).

Kochi et al. discloses a solid-state image pickup device (Fig. 7) with an optical system (Fig. 1) comprising at least one unit cell in a two-dimensional matrix having a photoelectric conversion portion (Fig. 7, #901), an amplifying means (Fig. 7, #903) to send a noise and optical signal (Fig. 7, #906), a transfer means with a first common line (Fig. 7, #911 and "φTX(n+1)"), a reset means (Fig. 7, #902) with a switch to provide an ON-state voltage to the reset (Fig. 9, portion related to "T₂), a selecting means with a second common line (Fig. 7, #904 and "φSEL(n+1)"), and a power line (Fig. 7, power to #902 and 904), wherein the photoelectric conversion portion, amplifying means, transfer means, reset means, and selecting means are all of the same conductivity type (col. 3, lines 39-42, and Figure 7).

However, Kochi et al. does not disclose wherein one common line performs between two unit cells operating in time series fashion nor a common power line.

Application/Control Number: 09/678,025

Art Unit: 2882

Goto et al. teaches wherein one common line performs between two unit cells operating in time series fashion (col. 3, lines 53-57).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have the one common line of Goto et al., with the device of Kochi et al., since one would be motivated to get the image output from each photodiode using just one line to conserve wires, costs, and space as implied from Goto et al. (col. 3, lines 34-57, and Fig. 1).

2. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yonemoto (US patent 5894325).

Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al. suggests a device as recited above.

However, Kochi et al. does not disclose a power line between two unit cells.

Yonemoto teaches a power line between two unit cells (Fig. 1, #14).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have the power line of Yonemoto with the suggested device of Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al., since one would be motivated to have the power line to power all cells from just one source as shown in Figure 1 of Yonemoto.

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ohba et al. (US Patent 4349743).

Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al. suggests a device as recited above.

Application/Control Number: 09/678,025

Art Unit: 2882

However, Kochi et al. does not disclose a signal processing circuit.

Ohba et al. teaches a signal processing circuit (col. 6, lines 45-49).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have the signal processing circuit of Ohba et al. with the suggested device of Kochi et al. in view of Goto et al., since one would be motivated to have the signal processing circuit to further process electrical signals, such as for correcting black or white level voltage as shown by Ohba et al. (col. 6, lines 40-49).

Response to Arguments

- 4. The objections to the drawings made in the Office Action mailed April 21, 2002, have been withdrawn in light of the amendment and proposals filed July 9, 2002.
- 5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (703) 605-

5298. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th (8 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular

communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

gk

October 23, 2002

HOBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EYANA

TECHNOLOGY CENTER ----